

REMARKS

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the recent in-person interview granted to Applicants' representative and conducted on September 19, 2006. At the interview proposed amendments to claims 1, 9 and 19 were proposed and discussed in relation to the applied prior art of record ("Short"). Claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended as proposed at the interview, and new claims 29 and 30 have been presented as proposed, thus, by this paper, claims 1, 9 and 10 have been amended, and claims 29 and 30 have been added.¹ Independent claim 1 (directed to a computer readable medium for use with a client), claim 9 (directed to a corresponding computer readable medium for use with a server), and 19 (directed to a corresponding Web service), with depending claims 2-8, 10-18 and 20-30 are therefore presented for reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 9, 13, 16, 19, 23, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by the book "Building XML Web Services for the Microsoft®.NET Platform" by Scott Short (hereinafter "Short"). In addition, claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious over Short in view of Thomas (U.S. Publ. No. 2001/0034743), claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious over Short in view of Pabla (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0162871), claims 6, 10, 11, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious over Short in view of Tan (U.S. Publ. No. 2003/0233360), claims 8 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious over Short in view of Frankel (U.S. Patent No. 5,392,448), claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious over Short in view of Matsushima (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0267808), claims 14, 15 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious over Short in view of Myllymaki (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0088713), claims 17, 18 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious over Short in view of Haswell (U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0193269), and claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious over Short in view of Crowe (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0035559).²

¹ Support for the claim amendments and new claims can be found throughout the original application, including at least the teachings in paragraphs [0002], [0003], [0019], [0030], [0027] and [0034] of the originally filed application (paragraph numbering according to U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0015375).

² Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should the need arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

In addition, claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As discussed in the interview, claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended to remove "class definitions for a service class", such that the rejection is now moot.

As discussed during the interview, and with respect to the rejection of the independent claims based on the Short reference, and as reflected in the interview summary, Applicants independent claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended and define computer readable media and Web services that are substantially different from Short. For example, as recited in claim 1, a computer readable medium includes computer-executable instructions that cause a client to receive a description document from a server. The description document includes class definitions for a generic object class and a plurality of object type classes which are derived from the generic object class and which correspond to a type of object in the database. In addition, the description document includes a Web service class which is derived from a parent Web service and which includes a plurality of database operation methods defined for the generic object class and derived from the generic service class, as well as at least one flag statement identifying an object type. The client further generates a database access request message for performing a database operation on a selected object type by determining whether the selected object type is created using the class definition for the selected object type in the received description document and the created object is serialized and included in a request message.

While the Short reference generally relates to building XML Web services for the Microsoft.NET runtime platform, it fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the independent claims. For example, among other things, Short fails to teach or suggest wherein a description document includes a Web service which is derived from a parent class, as recited in combination with the other recited claim elements.

In particular, Short discloses various examples of Web services that may be use different methods. For instance, Short describes a *PurchaseOrder* schema in which an XMLInclude statement includes a *CommentedPurchaseOrder* within a *PurchaseOrder* XML datatype, and which is based on a *PurchaseOrder* class. (Ch. 7, Sec. "Defining the *AcceptPO* Web Method", ll. 1-7, 17-27). In addition, Short discloses that an *AcceptPO* Web method can be defined for accepting a purchase order instance. (Ch. 7, Sec. "Defining the *AcceptPO* Web Method", ll. 1-16). Significantly, however, and as discussed during the interview, even if the Web service

includes a derived object type class, it fails to teach or suggest that a Web service is derived from a parent class as recited in combination with the other claim elements.

Accordingly, while Short teaches that object types and methods can be defined in a Web service, Short fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the recited claims, including at least that a Web service included in a description document is derived from a parent class. For at least the foregoing reasons, as well as the others discussed during the interview, Applicant submits that the rejections and assertions of record with respect to the independent and dependent claims are now moot, and therefore need not be addressed individually. However, in this regard, it should be appreciated that Applicant does not necessarily acquiesce to any assertions in the Office Action that are not specifically addressed above, and hereby reserves the right to challenge those assertions at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise, including any official notice.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims are neither anticipated nor made obvious by the art of record. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 24th day of October, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
COLBY C. NUTTALL
Registration No. 58,146
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCJ:CCN